

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,043	12/15/2003	Bruce E. Reidenberg	02755/100J533-US1	4015
7278 7590 12/27/2006 DARBY & DARBY P.C. P. O. BOX 5257 NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257			EXAMINER	
			KENNEDY, SHARON E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
			***	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/27/2006	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/736,043	REIDENBERG ET AL.			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this are	Sharon E. Kennedy	1615			
i eriod for Keply	nication appears on the cover sheet wi				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M  - Extensions of time may be available under the provision after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum s  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	WAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r munication. tatutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON	CATION. Teply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on				
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are rejected.		•			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	·				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restric	tion and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	the correction is required if the drawing/o	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		O MOC ACTION OF TO 10111 P 10-152.			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	or foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17 2(a))					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	•				
Attachment(s)	•				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sum	nman/ (RTO 412)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date.					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/16/04; 04/21/04; 05/05/04.	5) Notice of Infor 6) Other:	mat Patent Application			
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)					
· · (1/64. 00-00)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paner No /Mail Date 12222006			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action or the MPEP.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 40 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 40, one cannot refer back to the specification for the information. The figure must be reproduced in the claim.

Regarding claim 45, in view that the independent claim recites a transdermal delivery, the group is not appropriate. Transmucosal and transdermal are not analogous and neither one is a subset of the other. Dermal means skin and the drug goes through the skin. Mucosal means delivery through a mucous membrane, such as the mouth, nose, intrarectally, etc.

#### Double Patenting

Claims 1-45 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 10/736,049. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of this application over lap the claims of the '049 application in that each set of claims are directed to administering a specific dosage of buprenorphine to achieve pain relief via transdermal

**Art Unit: 1615** 

administration. Of particular note is the similarity of this application's claim 1 to the '049 application claim 4. This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Page 3

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hille et al., US 5,240,711. Hille exemplifies the fact that the administration of transdermal buprenorphine is already very well known. Hille discloses a 24 hour patch, however, it cannot be considered patentable to re-administer a drug dosage over time to treat chronic pain or pain that lasts more than a few days. The various formulations and time periods are considerations that any pain doctor undertakes in the normal routine of doing business with chronically ill patients on a daily basis. Further, even the ordinary consumer understands the concept of treating pain. Bottles of pain killers such as a bottle of aspirin do not come in one aspirin per bottle. In contrast, when one purchases a bottle of aspirin, the medicine is taken as needed for a single episode such as a minor headache, or over time for longer periods such as a sprained wrist or menstrual cramps, with the consumer adjusting the strength/dosage of the pain killer as necessary. In the absence of a showing or surprising results, the claimed dosages are nothing more than a routine description of common pain management practices known by anyone who has ever taken aspirin for a headache.

Application/Control Number: 10/736,043

Art Unit: 1615

Page 4

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon E. Kennedy whose telephone number is 571/272-4948. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on 571/272-8373.

Sharon E. Kennedy
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1615